PRESIDENT: Mr. Clerk, I understand we have an amendment to the amendment.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Hall would move to amend Senator Lynch's amendment. (Read Hall amendment found on page 183 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT: Senator Hall, please.

SENATOR HALL: Mr. President and members, the amendment that the Clerk has read is pretty simple to understand. It would limit Senator Lynch's amendment and the mandatory helmet bill to those individuals who are under the age of 21. Senator Landis. I would say, David, I want to discriminate against an even smaller group of individuals. In the past, I have not been a supporter of a mandatory helmet bill. I have been a vocal opponent when bill was brought up before. I also happen to be a former motorcycle rider for about 10 years. I owned and drove a motorcycle frequently and extensively. I enjoyed that. I wore a helmet on and off depending on where I was going and what I I probably wore the helmet on the highway where it was the safest place to drive, and didn't wear it in town where it was the most dangerous place to drive. I was not a supporter seat belt bill, although at times I think I did lend a hand on an amendment or two, but I do believe that the issue of education and the issue of protection and the issue of cost to society do have some merit. I have supported education issues that Senator Landis has brought and others have brought to the body before with regard to motorcycle safety. I look at this amendment as nothing more than an extension of that education. I see the issue of requiring individuals, young people, from the age of 16 to 21 to wearing of motorcycle helmets to be an extension of that education. Hopefully, if this amendment is adopted, and the bill pass, I could support LB 428 in that form. The most of the rest of the states in the country have motorcycle helmet laws that have a specific age under which an individual, basically young people, are required to There are only a handful, I think five or six, that have a motorcycle helmet bill that is written the way that Senator Lynch has LB 428 written. As a matter of fact, my amendment with a 21 age indication in it is probably more restrictive than most states. The vast majority of them have either the age of 18 or 19 is the age that is listed. I think if you look at the fact that if we do require these people for